

4

A N.
APPENDIX
TO THE
DEFENCE
Of our ANTIENT and MODERN,
HISTORIANS,
WHEREIN

The *Critical Historian's* REVIEW, &c.
of the said DEFENCE is Cross-
examined, and Confronted with *better*
Evidence.

By ZACHARY GREY L. L. D.

----- *Ita putant*
Sibi fieri Injuriam, ultro si,
Quam fecere ipsi, expostulant;
Et ultro accusant.-----

TERENT.

L O N D O N :

Printed for CHARLES RIVINGTON, at the Bible and
Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

M.DCC.XXV.

4

APPENDIX

INDEX

OF THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE



A N

APPENDIX.



I N T E N D not in these Papers to labour a Vindication of *Poor Dr. Grey*, from the heavy Charge lately brought against him by the Author of *The Review*, &c. much less to retaliate in Kind: I may be pardoned, if I neglect both the Provocation and the Opportunity. The Doctor, I can answer for him, is content with the small Share of Reputation he has with those that know him, and has not the least Ambition to be compared with so perfect an Original as that Author is. My present Design is only to give a Specimen of his accurate Skill in History; his intimate Acquaintance with our best Antient and Modern Historians; his exact Fidelity and Judgment in reporting his Authors; his scrupulous Care in quoting his Adversaries, and a constant Readiness to do them all Justice. Of all which, there is Plenty of Instances* in his last candid Performance: I shall present the Reader with a few, and leave the rest to his own Publication, when he shall please to discover any more of his Excellencies,

the Author of the *Defence* was not wholly in the Wrong: "He fetches (says the Bishop, *Historical Library*, Fol. p. 39.) the Originals of the *British Customs*, &c. from the *Phenicians*. This Conceit is borrowed from *Bochartus*; as for his own Part, 'tis visible that he equally understood the *Phenician*, *British*, *Gothick*, *Saxon*, and *Islandick* Languages, and, if left to himself, could as easily have brought the *Britains* from *New Spain*, and the *Saxons* from *Madagascar*." *Anthony Wood* likewise gives a very contemptible Character of him; for which I refer the Reader to his *Athen. Oxon.* Vol. 2. p. 879. Edit. 1.

But he tells us in the next Page;

Page 3. *That the Law-Doctor has laboured hard to prove that Vortigern King of the Britains was not deposed, but only gave up to his Son, and that we have no Account of his Deposition. But by the way, our impartial Critick has left out some Words, which would have explain'd the Law-Doctor's Meaning; who says, "Tis probable from Milton's Words, that he was not deposed, [as our Historian asserts,] but only gave it up to his Son, because he is here said to have reassumed it." And afterwards, Neither Malmsbury nor Milton from him, [which Words, 'tis to be feared, our Critick left out with Design,] give any Account of this Matter.* But he goes on;

Ibid. Dr. Hody uses the very Word deposed, Conv. p. 15. And Matthew Westminster, speaking of the Council that deposed him, tells us, *That they chose Aurelius Ambrosius King, Aurelium in Regem erexerunt.* If our Critick will pardon me, I will beg Leave to think, that he took this whole Sentence from Dr. Hody, where it is to be met with, and not from Matthew Westminster,

notwithstanding his Pretence to great Reading. Now after all that has been said, if I may venture to speak a Word in behalf of the Author of the *Defence*, he only argues from *Henry of Huntington's* calling it an Excommunication; for the Probability of the Thing from *Milton's* Words, concerning his *reassuming the Government*, and *Mahmsbury's* Silence in the Case, not with any Design, I dare say, of imposing upon the Reader, as our great Critick *unkindly* insinuates.

But to proceed, he refers us again to a Passage in *Tyrrel's* Introduction without referring to the Page. And if he will not take it amiss, I will still take the Liberty of suspending my Judgment concerning the Truth of it, till he and I meet.

But he goes on,

Ibid. He mentions two Most Reverend worthy Prelates of our Church, and one especially, my Lord Grace of Canterbury, who has confirmed what I have said of the Being of Parliaments in the Quotation Dr. Grey brings against it: That King Alfred appointed Parliaments, says his Grace, to meet twice a Year, is, I confess, reported in the *Mirror of Justice*; and that is all that I pretended to in that Place. If the Reader will be pleased to take along with him the following Words of his Grace, he will soon be convinced how far he agrees with the Critick, and the *Mirror of Justice*.
 "Of what Credit (says he, *State of the Church and*
 "Clergy, p. 135.) such a Relation ought to be in a
 "Matter, where not only the Laws of King *Al-*
 "fred, but all our Historians are silent, is not
 "so difficult a Matter to determine. Moreover,
 "the Persons who constituted King *Alfred's* Par-
 "liaments were only the Great Men of the
 "Realm, *Comites congregari fecit*, says *Horn* (*Mir-*
 "ror

“ror. Loc. citat.) to those two Great Councils:
 “And I see no Reason why his Authority should
 “not be as great for the Persons, of which their
 “Councils consisted, in which our antient Au-
 “thors are generally of his Side, as for the
 “Times of their Assembling, in which (for ought
 “I know) he stands alone, without so much as one
 “Writer before him to support his Allegation.”

As for Sir Henry Spelman's Opinion, concerning
 the Word *Parliament*, the Author of the *Defence*
 has sufficiently proved from his *Glossary*, compared
 with his other Writings, that he differs point blank
 from our *Critical Historian*, *Defence*, p. 29.

But he informs us,

Ibid. That he shall content himself with the Light
 Spelman has given in this Respect. And what Dr.
 Hody takes from him, That the Council of Kingsbury
 is to be esteemed not an Episcopal Synod, but a Parlia-
 ment. And all this does not amount to a Proof,
 that it was a Council or *Parliament*, (as he will
 have it,) consisting of King, Lords, and Commons;
 for neither Spelman, nor Hody, mention any such
 Thing. “Sir Henry Spelman (says Hody, *Hist. of*
 “*Conv.* p. 57.) tells us, That the Council of Kings-
 “bury is to be esteemed not an Episcopal Synod,
 “but a Parliament, as well because it was
 “held at the King's Court, [for so the Word
 “*Kingsbury* denotes] as because it was held in
 “*Easter-Week*. For, according to antient Cus-
 “tom, the Great Men were obliged to attend the
 “King at the three Great Festivals, *Christmas*,
 “*Easter*, and *Whitsontide*, as well to honour his
 “Person, and adorn his Court, as to consult
 “about the Grand Affairs of the Kingdom.” Not
 one Word of the Commons, as a Constituent
 Branch of these Great Councils; nay, the
 very Title of the Council shews the contrary;
Concilium Kingesburie sub Bertulpho Rege Merciorum,
Sexta

*Sexta feria Paschatis, Anno Christi 851. Celebratum, Presentibus Ceolnotho Dorobornensi Archiepiscopo, Cate-
risque Mercie Episcopis & Magnatibus. Spelman Con-
cil. Tom. I. p. 344.* And in his Observations upon
the Council, he says expressly, That the *Proceres*,
which Hody translates *Great Men*, by an old Cus-
tom, were bound to attend the King upon the
three Great Festivals of *Christmas, Easter, and*
Whitsontide. Ibid. p. 347.

But to proceed ;

Page 6. Dr. Grey (says he) cites out of him, [Spel-
man.] (Observe again Reader, this last Word is
not the *Critical Historian's*; for unless I explain
myself, he may possibly say, as before, that I
falsify,) That he never found any Place for the
Commons in the Great Councils in the Saxon
Times, p. II. What then is meant by *Rex Popu-
lum suum convocavit, in the Laws of King Ethel-
bert*? Nothing, I really believe, that will be of
any great Service to him: For these Ecclesiasti-
cal Dooms of King Ethelbert, King of Kent, were
made in the Year 602. by the Advice of his
Wisemen, or, 'tis expressly mention'd in the *Pre-
face*, who orders in his first Doom, " That if the
" King called his People together, (he does not
" mention in what Way,) and any one offered any
" Injury to them, he should restore double, and
" moreover pay to the King 50 Shillings." *Spel-
man. Concil. Tom. I. p. 127.*

Ibid. What by *Principum, Procerum, Comitum, &
omnium Sapientum, Seniorum, & Populorum to-
tius Regni, in King Ina's Reign*? The Words are,
" *Omnium Senatorum Meorum, & natu majorum Sapien-
" tum Populi mei,* in Spelman. Concil. Tom. I. p. 182.
which the Learned Mr. Johnson in his Collection of
Ecclesiastical Laws, Part I. A. D. 693. translates,
" *Aldermen,* and the *Senior Counsellors* of my Nation.
" And the Aldermen, he says, were they who
" had

AN APPENDIX.

7

“ had the chief Superintendence of any large
 “ District, or City.” And if so, here cannot yet be
 any Room for the Representatives of the Com-
 mons, a as Constituent Part of the Councils of
 that Age. Nor could Sir *Henry Spelman* think
 that either of these two Instances had any
 Relation to the Representatives of the People, by
 his declaring elsewhere, “ That the first Light
 “ wherein he discovers the Form of our Parlia-
 “ ments at this present Day, is what ariseth in
 “ the *Magna Charta* of King *John*, *Reliq. Spelman*.
 “ p. 57. 522 Years after this Council of King *Ina*’s.”

Ibid. When *Dr. Hody* attacks this antient Au-
 thor’s Authority, ’tis with Reference to the Inter-Marri-
 ages of the Saxons and Britains then, and not to the Po-
 pulorum; which he takes particular Notice of, p. 33.
Dr. Hody’s Words are what follow; and how agreeable
 they are to our Critick’s Modest Assertion, I leave
 the Reader to judge. “ In this Reign, says he, (*Hist.*
 “ of Convocat. p. 33.) the Saxons and Britains are said
 “ to have begun to inter-marry with one ano-
 “ ther; per Commune consilium, & assensum omnium
 “ Episcoporum, & Principum, Procerum, Comitum,
 “ & omnium Seniorum, & Populorum, [the very
 “ Words which, he says, *Hody* does not attack
 “ this Author for,] Totius Regni, & per Præceptum
 “ *Ina prædicti*. The Author that tells us this,
 “ (says *Hody*) is the Interpolator of King *Edward*
 “ the Confessor’s thirty fifth Law; but he is a very
 “ Fabulous one, and of no Authority.” And his
 Grace of *Canterbury* says, — “ That the Laws
 “ of *Ina* were published in a Great Council, is on
 “ all Hands allowed.” And the Persons there pre-
 sent, Bishops, Aldermen, and *Witen*, or Wisemen,
 I think plainly discovers it.

Ibid. How must we understand the *Populo Terræ*,
 in the Laws of King *Oswald*? The Archbishop of
Canterbury, (*State of the Church*, &c. p. 146. and
Spelman.

Spelman. Concil. Tom. I. p. 293.) speaking of King Oswald's Council held in Northumberland, say, " *Ad quem convenerunt omnes Principes Regionis tam Ecclesiastici, quam Seculares* ; which plainly proves who were the Members present at it, and, I hope, in some Measure, answers our Learned Author's Question.

Pag. 7. *What is meant by Comitum, Procerum, totius terræ, aliorumque Fidelium infinita Multitudine, an Infinite Multitude at the Assembly at Winchester? Anno 855.* The Title of that Council will plainly shew what is meant by these Words, and who the Constituent Members were ; " *Concilium Wintoniæ Pananglic, 5 Non Novembr. An. Gra. 855. Indict 4. Celebrat. præsentibus Æthelwulfo West-Saxonia, Beorredo Rege Mercia, & Edmundo Rege East-Anglorum, una cum Archiepiscopis Cantuar. & Eborum, cæterisque totius Angliæ Episcopis, & Magnatibus,*" Spelman. Concil. Tom. I. p. 348. Indeed, in the Conclusion, p. 350. are these Words: *Præsentibus & subscribentibus Archiepiscopis, & Episcopis Angliæ universis, nec non Beorredo Rege Mercia, Edmundo East-Anglorum Rege, Abbatum, & Abbatissarum, Ducum, Comitum, Procerumque totius terræ, aliorumque, fidelium infinita Multitudine regium Chirographum laudaverunt: Dignitates vero sua nomina subscripserunt.* Which plainly shews, if we will make Sense of it, that most of these were but Standers-by, and Approvers, and the *Dignitates*, here mention'd, were the only Subscribers. Spelman says, that this is wanting in *Malmsbury*. But let us take it even in our Critick's Sense, and if the *fidelium infinita Multitudo* signify the Representatives of the Commons, and were a Constituent Part of the Council, then by the same Reason, the *Abbatissa*, [*Abbeses*,] who are named before them, were a Part of that Council. Which, I hope, our Learned Critick has more Modesty than to affirm. " That many,"
" says

“ says his Grace of Canterbury, [*State of the Church,*
 “ &c. p. 137.] have been occasionally admitted to
 “ them [viz. *Councils*,] at the solemn Opening or
 “ Closing of them; or at other extraordinary Sea-
 “ sons, when Laws were to be published, or (it may
 “ be) Charters to be confirmed, I don’t deny.
 “ It is upon these Occasions, that not only the
 “ People, but our Queens, not only the Clergy,
 “ but Abbesses, are some Times spoken of, as
 “ being present there; of whom, I yet believe,
 “ this Gentleman will not affirm, that they were
 “ proper Constituent Members, even for Appro-
 “ bation of these Meetings: That being occa-
 “ sionally present, they might sometimes sub-
 “ scribe as Witnesses, or give some Token of
 “ their Assent or Liking to what had been done
 “ by the King, or his Council, I can also allow:
 “ But that any besides our Great Men and
 “ Prelates, were wont to be called to these Coun-
 “ cils, as the proper Members of them, or that
 “ the Members so called, were ever distinguish-
 “ ed into such as had Right of Suffrage and Sub-
 “ scription, and such as were present chiefly in
 “ order to approve, I am yet to learn. Again,
 “ Of *Ina’s* last Charter (says he) we have three
 “ Copies: In two of them these Subscriptions
 “ are intirely wanting: In the Third, if they
 “ prove any Thing, it is more than he would
 “ have. The Subscribers are Archbishops, Bi-
 “ shops, and two Kings, *Beorrede* King of *Mercia*,
 “ and *Edmund* King of the *East-Angles*, with an
 “ infinite Multitude of Abbots, Abbesses, Dukes,
 “ Earls, and Nobles of the whole Land, who
 “ all commended or approved the King’s Char-
 “ ter. *Dignitates vero sua nomina subscripserunt.*
 “ How shall we here discover whom these *Digni-*
 “ *tates* include? None below Bishops are said to
 “ have subscribed: All the Rest are joined in

“ an equal and opposite Class of Approvers :
 “ And if we take it thus, then the Nobles, and
 “ Regular Prelates, no less than the People, are
 “ excluded from all Right of Suffrage and Sub-
 “ scription.

“ If to avoid this, he shall think fit to carry
 “ it farther, and take in all but the *Fideles*, it
 “ will then be another Question ; Whether *Fi-*
 “ *deles* do there denote the Common People ? Espe-
 “ cially when join’d to the Great Lords, with such
 “ a Relative as it there is, *Ducum, Comitum, Pro-*
 “ *cerumque, totius Terræ, aliorumque Fidelium* ? Or
 “ if *this too should be granted*, yet still the greatest
 “ Difficulty of all will remain, how to prove
 “ that these *Fideles*, whoever they be, were all
 “ proper Members of this Council, which, at
 “ this Rate, must have been a very large Assembly
 “ indeed ; *Infinita, Fidelium Multitudine*, says
 “ the Subscription : An Expression which can
 “ hardly be reconciled to the Proportion of an
 “ ordinary State Council, or to the constant
 “ Members of such a one.

“ But what if we should suppose this to have
 “ been a more than ordinary Convention ? And
 “ that this Pious King designing so great and
 “ general Privilege to the Church, as to assure
 “ to it the Tenth of all his Dominions for ever ;
 “ to free it from secular Service, from all Tri-
 “ butes, and Taxes, even from the *Trinoda Ne-*
 “ *cessitas* of Expeditions, Building of Bridges
 “ and Fortifying of Castles, (which where wont
 “ to be reserved in those Cases where Lands
 “ were granted in the most free Manner to the
 “ Clergy,) should call all the landed Men of
 “ his Kingdom to it ; that so what was to con-
 “ cern all, might be consented to by all ? What
 “ if this Charter, made in Council, and agreed
 “ upon there, were (as is it most probable) after-
 “ wards

“wards published, and subscribed in a general
 “Assembly of both Lords, Prelates, Clergy,
 “and People, in the Great Church at *Winchester*?
 “which indeed I take to have been the Case,
 “and shall hereafter give some farther Reasons
 “for it. I don’t see but in any of these Sup-
 “positions, we may very well allow the *Fideles*,
 “in the lowest Sense, to have been present
 “at this Assembly, without being ever the more
 “entitled thereby to any constant Place, or
 “Right of Consent in the other ordinary Councils
 “of the Realm.”

Pag. 7. *What is meant by Tota Regni ingenuitate & innumera Populi multitudine, in King Edgar’s third Council, in the Year 970?* I presume he means the Council of *London*, in the Twelfth of *King Edgar*, in the Year 970, or 971, according to *Spelman*, which was called for the Confirmation of the Privileges of the Abbey of *Glastenbury*. The Constituent Members of which were as follow: *Præsentibus* [says *Spelman*, Concil. Tom. i. p. 483.] *pacifico Rege ipso Edgardo, Alfgina Regis Matre, Edwardo Clitone, id est, Regni Successore. Kmedio Rege Albania sive Scotia. Mascu suo Archipirata, seu Marium præfecto, Dunstano Archiepiscopo Dorobernia, Oswaldo Archiepiscopo Eboracensi, Cæterisque Episcopis, & Omnibus Regni Prælatibus ut Liqueat in Calce Concilii.*

Ibid. He makes a great Stir about *Sapientes Aldermani*, and the like *Wisemen* and *Aldermen*, in the *Saxon Parliaments*. Let the Terms be how you will: Call those Assemblies *Wittenagemots*, *Mychelgemotes*, *Councils*, *Colloquies*, what you please: I think enough is said, to prove that the Commons assisted at those Assemblies, &c. Not as Constituent Members, as the Author of the *Defence* has fully proved from *Archbishop Wake*, whose Authorities our Critick has thought proper to pass over

in Silence. And whether the Archbishop's Authority, or our Critical Historian's, is to be most depended upon, I believe the Reader will not stand long to determine. And to pass over his Reflections upon Sir Henry Spelman, and Mr. Camden, who can't possibly suffer any Damage (but the contrary) from his ill Treatment,

He proceeds in the following Manner :

Pag. 8. *My Words*, (says he,) p. 30. are the same he quotes. Canute was made King, ab omni anglorum Populo. Against this he brings Dr. Hody, [and he might have added his Friend Tyrrel too,] p. 23. King Ethelred being Dead, the Bishops, Abbots, & Proceres Terræ, rejected his Family, and proclaimed Canute for their King : And then flies out into a passionate Exclamation, and cries, Mark Reader ! mind what a clear-headed Doctor this is ! Notwithstanding the Wise Comment, he has given us upon the Anglorum Populus, for which I refer the Reader to his Learned Book, p. 9. with all his Learning, he is not able to distinguish betwixt the Omnis Anglorum Populus, his darling Mob, and the Bishops, Abbots, and Proceres Terræ, who are said to have rejected Ethelred's Family, and to have proclaimed Canute their King.

Pag. 10. In the next Page, (says our Critick,) he charges me with falsifying the Greek Professor, whom I quoted; for saying, Conventio quorum videtur esse Parliamentum, he adds, Hody says no such Thing : My Words the direct contrary. Hody speaks of a Parliament, and a Charter, in which were these Words, Conventio quorum videtur esse Parliamentum. Here's a good Man for you ! And here he is again : Hody has these Words, speaking of the Charter. I am really amazed at the Assurance of the Gentleman; and were I disposed to use Language like his own, I might with too much Reason

Reason say, That his Conscience is as hard as his Forehead. He says, that Dr. Hody asserts That there was a Parliament, and a Charter, in which were these Words, *Conventio quorum videtur esse Parliamentum*: When Dr. Hody expressly asserts the contrary, as the Author of the *Defence* has already taken Notice. And Hody's Words are as follow: "In the Margin of the Charter" (says he, *Hist. of Convocat.* p. 156, 157.) is noted "in a late Hand, *Nota hic hos omnes convocari a Rege sua autoritate, ad causas Religionis tractandas, tam nobiles de clero, quam principes Regni, cum aliis inferioris gradus: Conventio quorum videtur esse Parliamentum.* I agree with the Writer, That "it was a Parliament; but perhaps these are "the Words not of the Charter itself, as is commonly understood, but of the *Registrary*, who "lived long after that Time, in the Reign of "King Edward III. as appears from the Hand." And tho' Dr. Hody takes this to be no Part of the Charter, but the *Registrary*, who lived long after, yet this Modest Gentleman asserts, That Hody calls it Part of the Charter.

Pag. 11. The next Quotation (he tells us) that the Author of the *Defence* takes from him, is concerning William Rufus's Succession, when his elder Brother Robert Duke of Normandy was alive. Dr. Zachary (says he) affirms, with the last Assurance, That William Rufus came in by a different Claim than that of Election.

Had our Critick fairly quoted what Dr. Zachary (as he contemptibly calls him) says, with his Authorities for saying so; The Doctor would have had no just Cause of Offence against him. The Author of the *Defence* says, p. 27. "That William "Rufus came in by a different Claim from that "of Election. His Right to the Crown was "grounded upon his Father's Will, by which "he

“ he gave Normandy to his eldest Son Robert ;
 “ England to his second Son William Rufus ;
 “ and a Sum of Money, or his Mother’s Posses-
 “ sions, to his third Son Henry.” And for this he
 produces, as Authorities, the *History of Ingulfus*,
 the *Annals of Waverly*, *Matthew Westminster*, *Flo-*
rence of Worcester, *Walter Hemingsford*, *Brompton*, and
 Bishop *Godwin*, (Authorities our Critick will find
 it a hard Matter to invalidate.) And yet after
 all this, he cries out, Dr. Zachary has affirmed with
 the last Assurance ; as if he had no other Au-
 thority but his own to depend upon in this
 Case.

Ibid. Gervase of Tilbury, and Dr. Hody from
 him, both assure us, that he was elected King. But
 they don’t say that he was elected by the Peo-
 ple, but by the Archbishop of Canterbury. “ The
 “ Conqueror dying, (says Hody, p. 174.) 1087.
 “ Sept. 9. William Rufus, his second Son, in the
 “ Absence of his elder Brother Robert, was elect-
 “ ed King by Archbishop Lanfranc, as Gerva-
 “ sius tells us. [Gervaf. Act. Pont. Cant. Script. x.
 “ p. 1655. *Convocatis Episcopis & Primoribus An-*
 “ *glia Lanfrancus elegit, Willielmum filium re-*
 “ *gis, &c.*] Eadmer says, That without the
 “ Archbishop’s Consent, he could by no Means
 “ obtain the Crown ; and therefore to prevail
 “ with him, he made him a great many so-
 “ lemn Promises, both by himself and others,
 “ That if he were made King, he would in
 “ all Things observe Justice, Equity, and Mercy,
 “ and be governed wholly by his Counsel.
 “ He was crown’d, as Brompton says, *Convocatis*
 “ *terra Magnatibus at Westminster, Sept. 27.*” And
 does not the Defence, p. 28. say pretty near
 the same Thing ? “ He brought to Archbishop
 “ Lanfranc his Father’s Donation ; which he ha-
 “ ving read, and taking all the Security that “ his

“ his Promise and Oath could afford for his
 “ civil and kind Usage of the Clergy, he
 “ made all imaginable haste with him to *Lon-*
 “ *don*, and by his Interest in the Clergy, and
 “ Influence over several great Men, on *Mi-*
 “ *chaelmas* Day, with their Consent, he anointed
 “ him King in *St. Peter's Westminster*.

Ibid. I say in the Reign of Henry I. he was
 made King universo Populo. So says he ; but being
 an excellent Linguist, he translates all the People,
 the Clergy, and the Nobility only. He does not
 translate it so, but only infers it from *Matthew*
Paris's own Words ; who though he says in one
 Place, *Congregato Londoniis Clero, & populo universo*
promisit emendationem legum, &c. yet he explains
 it in the same Page, *Ad hac Clero respondente, &*
magnatibus cunctis. (To which agrees *Eadmer.*)
 So that the Author of the *Defence* had Reason
 enough to have made such a Translation, if our
Critick's Affirmation had been true. From hence
 the Gentleman goes on with the same Modesty,
 with which he set out at first;

Page 12. *We are not come* (says he) *to a Jure Di-*
vino Reign; However, he will enter his Protest against
 any other, and go on gainsaying. *Gervase of Til-*
bury writes, *That King Stephen was crown'd Con-*
vocatis Episcopis & Proceribus, & Wikes annuen-
tibus Præfulibus, & Proceribus Regni; which this
Rarity translates thus, *It is evident he was set up,*
and crown'd by a Faction. To pass by the Flowers
 of Rhetorick in this most beautiful Paragraph,
 I can't but think that our *Critick* has acted a
 little Unfairly in this Place to keep his Hand
 in ; for the Author of the *Defence* neither quotes,
 nor translates *Gervase of Tilbury*, nor *Wikes* ; but
 makes this Inference from *Malmshury*, who in-
 forms us, “ *That Stephen, by his own Dexterity,*
 “ *and the Artifice of his Brother Roger Earl of*
 “ *Salisbury,*

“Salisbury, gain’d over many of the Nobility
 “to him: He names no great Council that was
 “called, either for his Election, or the Solemnity
 “of his Coronation, at which there were
 “only three Bishop’s present, the Archbishop
 “of Canterbury, the Bishops of *Winton* and *Salisbury*,
 “no Abbots; and but very few Noblemen;
 “*Tribus Episcopis presentibus, nullis Abbatibus, & paucissimis optimatibus.*” Wil. Malmsb. scriptor post.
 Bed. p. 178.

He farther observes from *Radulphus de Diceto*,
 “That the Archbishop was imposed upon by
 “*Hugh Bigod*, Steward of the King’s Household,
 “who took an Oath, that the King disinherited
 “his Daughter the Empress, and appointed *Stephen*
 “Earl of *Boloign* his Successor.

As to the *Cotton Manuscript*, I hope he will
 not take it ill, if I don’t yet take his Word
 for it, since he has not referred us to the Page
 in *Hody*, in which mention is made of it, and
 since the Account of the Meeting at *Salisbury*
 (to which it relates) has been fully confuted
 by his Grace of *Canterbury*, as the Author of
 the *Defence*, p. 33. has already observed.

Pag. 13. He has an Interrogatory for me, (says
 the Critick;) I said Henry was a *Principibus vocatus*,
 & a *Populo desideratus*. What does all this
 amount to? (says he:) Not to a Proof of the King’s
 being chosen by the People. He’s surprisingly Dull: Yet
 it does amount to such a Proof; *Vocatus* here can
 have, no other Signification. His Mother, the
 Empress *Maud*, being alive, in whom was the Hereditary
 Right, tho’ the Doctor says, boldly and falsely,
 it was in himself, which it could not be till after
 his Mother’s Death. Dr. Grey tells us, *Vocatus*
 should be invited; I tell him, it should be Called,
 and that Called, Invited, and Elected, are all one.
 What Dr. Grey observes, is not without Authority:

rity: He speaks it from *Gervase of Tilbury*, who says, (as the Doctor has observed before, p. 34.) "That he was consecrated King, as some imagine, by *Theobald* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and receiv'd his Dominions without any Diminution of Right, and his Coronation was attended with the Joy and Acclamations of the People, crying out, *Long live the King.*" And for what Reason our Critick kept this Authority out of View, the Reader (who, by this Time, must thoroughly know his Character) need not be inform'd.

Pag. 14. He rebukes me (says the Critick) for saying after *Gervase*, That there were *Inferioris ordinis Personæ*, in the Parliament at *Northampton*. And he does it with a good deal of Authority, proving from Archbishop *Wake*, "That the *Inferioris ordinis Personæ*, the *Populi multitudo non modica*, were only admitted to hear the Tryals that came before the King and his Council; but were not therefore of it." As the Reader may be convinced by consulting the Archbishop's *State of the Church*, &c. p. 34.

Ibid. I will confirm (says he,) what I said of the Parliament of *Clarendon*, That by *Proceres Regni*, must be understood the Chief of the Commonalty, since the Earls and Barons at that Time were the Nobility, and are particularly mentioned. *Hoveden* tells us, the Clergy and Laity were gathered together there: *Matthew Paris* mentions the Clergy, Counts, Barons, and *Proceres Regni*; which *Dr. Hody*, p. 221. translates the Chief of the Commonalty. And I will take the Liberty, in Answer, to insert the Authority of Bishop *Wake* from the *Defence*, &c. and leave the Reader to judge (which I am satisfied he will not be long a doing) which Authority is best. "Let us hear, says the Archbishop, (*State of the Church*, p. 179.) who were

" called to this Parliament of Clarendon: The
 " Acts of the Assembly, still remaining, enume-
 " rate them; *Omnes Episcopi, Anglicani, & Comi-*
 " *tatus, & Barones, Magistratus, & Nobiles.* Ralf
 " *de Diceto*, a Contemporary Historian, says in
 " like manner of them, *Episcopi & Proceres*:
 " *Gervase* calls them, *Pontifices & Proceres, Pras-*
 " *ules & Proceres*: *Matthew Paris*, more particu-
 " larly, *Prasidente Jo. de Oxonia, Prasidentibus*
 " *Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus, Prioribus, &*
 " *Comitibus, & Proceribus Regni.* The Recognition
 " of the Clergy was made before the Arch-
 " bishops and Bishops, Earls and Barons, and
 " by the most Noble and Antient of the King-
 " dom, *Thomas* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *Roger*
 " Archbishop of *Tork*, and twelve Bishops agreed
 " to keep and observe it, in the Presence of
 " thirty eight great Lords, and many other
 " Lords and Nobles of the Kingdom, as well
 " Clergy as Laity. This is a plain and full Ac-
 " count of the Matter, and entirely determines
 " the Case: The two Archbishops, with twelve
 " of the Suffragan Bishops, made the Promise;
 " the Parliament, Clergy, and Laity were pre-
 " sent at it, and Witnesses to it: No others but
 " the Bishops swore; no others but those who
 " made a Part of the *Proceres & Nobiles Regni*
 " were present when they swore." As I am
 forced sometimes to repeat what the Author of
 the *Defence* has already said from Archbishop
Wake, and other good Authorities, so I hope the
 Critick's unfair Way of citing, (he leaving out
 every Thing that makes against him,) will plead
 my Excuse with the Impartial Reader.

Pag. 16. Another Interrogatory (says he) is started,
 to which I am to give in my Answer; and it shall be
 upon Oath, if that would do. In Crit. Hist. p. 37.
 I said the King of Scotland did Homage to King
 John,

John, at the famous Parliament at Lincoln, in conspectu omnis Populi: Upon which he demands, *What if the King of Scotland and King John met upon the Top of a high Hill?* And the Question was not, in my Opinion, very improper: For if they met upon a high Hill upon *Lincoln Heath*, as is affirmed by *Walter Hemingford* and *Matthew Paris*, then it could not with any Propriety be called a Meeting of Parliament, as our Learned Critick affirms.

Pag. 19. He adds, (says our Critick,) *That Walter de Langton was not Bishop of Chester, but Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry. This is an amazing Instance of his profound Learning! The Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, was then Bishop of Chester; and so continued to the Reformation, if we may in any Thing give Credit to Peter Heylin, &c.*

For all our Critick's great Learning, this is just as great an Impropriety, as it would be to call the Archbishop of Canterbury, Archbishop of Lambeth or Croydon; the Archbishop of York, the Archbishop of *Bishopsthorp*, because they have Palaces in those several Places. And admitting *Chester* was in the Diocese of *Litchfield*, yet if he does not know it, he may be informed, that *Chester* was not erected into a Bishoprick till the 33d of *Henry VIII.* in the Year 1541. *Rymer's Fæder. Vol. 14. p. 717.* *John Bird* the first Bishop, and *Walter de Langton* was Bishop of *Litchfield* and *Coventry*, Anno 1295. just 246 Years before; Nor is he called Bishop of *Chester*; by either *Goodwin*, de Præsul. p. 373, 374, 375. *Wharton*, *Anglia Sacra*, Par. 1. p. 441, 447, 449, 451. or *Le Neve*, *Fæsti Eccl. Angl.* p. 124.

Pag. 20. Nothing was ever falser, (he says) than what *Dr. Zachary* adds, *That I took the Exceptions to the Pope's Letter, Word for Word, from Sir Henry Spelman, without the Ingenuity to own it, or name*

my Author at all: Every Word and Syllable I took from Mr. Sammes, Bishop Godwin, and Mr. Fox. If he did so, Dr. Zachary has a great deal of Reason to beg his Pardon; but as he quoted no Authority, Dr. Zachary might be easily lead into the Mistake. And our Critick had good Luck (if he took the Substance from Mr. Sammes, Bishop Godwin, and Mr. Fox,) to hit upon so exact a Translation of Sir Henry Spelman's Words. So for his Honour, and the Reader's Satisfaction, I will take the Liberty of setting his *English* Translation, and Sir Henry Spelman's *Latin*, in two opposite Columns.

Critical Hist. p. 63.

Spelman. Concil.

Tom. 1. p. 35.

IN the Text, it is said to have been written in the Year of our Lord, 169, in the Margin, 156, and neither of these Dates agree with Eleutherius's Papacy.

For though Bede, says he, was made Bishop of Rome in the Year 167, yet Eusebius, in his Chronicle, refers the Beginning of his Pontificate to the sixteenth Year of the Emperor Antoninus, that is, to the Year of our Lord, 179; but much better in his History to the following Year of Antoninus,

PRimo haud feliciter hic se habet Synchronismus, alias enim scribi dicitur, Anno Domini 169, alias ut in margine 156, & convenit quidem neuter numerus Eleutherii Pontificatui. Nam licet Beda eum factum ait Romæ Præsulem Anno Domini 167, Eusebius tamen in suo Chronico Pontificatus ipsius initium refert ad Annum 16, Antonini Imperatoris, id est, Domini Nostri 179, & consultius in Historia sua ad sequentem Antonini annum,

toninus. which was in the Year of our Lord 180,

To which latter Opinion agrees Baronius.

Pag. 63. In the Epistle is the Word, Manu-tenere, which we translate Maintain, and was not in use in Eleutherius's Time, but smells rather of the Norman-Law Latin.

The Texts of Scripture, quoted in his Epistle, are the Translation of St. Jerome, who lived two hundred Years after Eleutherius.

The Epistle came not into the World, till a thousand Years after its pretended Date.

Pag. 21. I own my Abhorrence (says our Critick) of the Lives of the Monks, and my Contempt of their Learning, some few excepted; and nothing else could have induced me to name Dr. Tanner with Dugdale. I am sorry that what I have said of Dr. Tanner has exposed him to the Panegyrics of so worthless a Flatterer: I respect that Gentleman for his Learning and Merit.

And yet in one Place, where he names him by himself, p. 65. he quotes him, (I will not say falsely, for that Word would but too much resemble his own polite Language, but) unfairly, and then calls him a Lover of Monkeny. In another, p. 81. The great Pains (says he) that Dugdale,

“ annum, qui est Domini Nostri 180.

“ Huic enim Sententiae accedit Baronius.

Pag. 36, “ Quinto habetur hic, vox Manu-

“ tenere, Eleutherii saculo non in usu, sed

“ Normanicam plane Latinitatem redolens.

“ Sexto loca quæ e

“ Sacra Scriptura hic

“ citantur, sumpta sunt e

“ Translatione divi Hieronimi, qui 200 pene

“ annos post Eleutherium floruit.

“ Septimo non reperitur hæc Epistola us-

“ quam gentium infra

“ mille annos post excessum Eleutherii.

dale and Tanner have taken to preserve the Memory of the Monks and Monasteries, shews the good Liking they have to Fryars and Nuns, and their Willingness, like the Israelites, to return again to Egypt.

Let him reconcile these two Characters if he can? *Et erit mihi magnus,* —

The Author of the Defence cannot, sure, forbear putting off his Hat to the Critick when he next meets him, for the great Pains he has taken to set him right, as to the Names of the two Romish Missionaries.

Pag. 23. But the next false Assertion, (he says,) for which the Author of the Defence deserves good Discipline, [no less, then a good Drubbing, to be sure, being a Parson,] is p. 55. The Fault is the more enormous, it being in Ecclesiastical History, and against his beloved and esteemed Mr. Echard, speaking of the before-mentioned Chasm of the Succession, of whom I purposely left out eight. I can't help telling the Reader that Tallent's Tables, the best Chronology extant, lay open before me, [I can tell him of a better, and that is his own Sweet Self, who founded the Bishoprick of Chester 246 Years before its Time, as has been before observed,] when I was linking that uninterrupted Chain, and there were all the Names of the Popes, from Pope Paul, to Pope Odescalchi; and the Doctor has only picked up a Dozen of them, and those wrong in the very Beginning of the Catalogue, Petrus Linus, and it should have been Paulus Linus; nay, he is so bold in the Falsity, that he says, It should be Peter, not Paul, twice in a Page, directly contrary to which, Mr. Echard, Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 388. l. 22. says, Linus succeeded Paul, Cletus succeeded Linus, and so on to the End of the Chapter. Now what Correction does a Man deserve, who will so directly misquote or misapply Authorities? I will not say, that he false quotes Talent; but if the Reader will pardon

don a Pun, I will take upon me to say, That he has the best *Talent* at citing his Authors unfairly, that ever I met with. Mr. *Echard*, in the very Place referred to, makes both St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* to be Bishops of *Rome*, the one of the Circumcision, the other of the Uncircumcision, and says, *Linus* and *Cletus* succeeded *Paul*, and *Clemens* St. *Peter*; and immediately after there was a Coalition, and does not carry the Succession from St. *Paul* one Jot farther, though our Learned Critick says unfairly, That he continued it to the End of the Chapter.

Mr. *Echard*, in *Folio Edit. Book 2. p. 244.* says, "That a Bishoprick was founded in *Rome* by St. *Peter*, who was now succeeded by *Linus*, the same mentioned, 2 *Tim. 4. 21.* But many of the Antients (says he) mention both these Apostles, as equally concerned in founding this Bishoprick, and do expressly assert *Linus* to have been the first Bishop of *Rome*. Indeed, in another Place, p. 267. he says, We are told *Linus*, St. *Peter's*, or, perhaps, St. *Paul's* Successor, suffered Martyrdom this Year: And in his Chronological Table, *Ann. Dom. 67.* he says, That this Bishoprick was founded by St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*." And to produce him an Authority superior to that of Mr. *Talent*, and that is *Eusebius*, from whom the Succession is drawn out by *Valesius*, in the following Manner, *Ordo Episcoporum Urbis Romæ, &c. Petrus Apostolus post quem. 1. Linus, 2. Anacletus, 3. Clemens*, and so on. Nay, *Talent* himself says, That there are great Differences about the first six Bishops of *Rome*, for which he quotes *Baronius, An. Dom. 69.* "St. *Paul*, says he, is said to be Bishop here *Epiph*: And that St. *Peter* and he are the two Heads of the Church, that make but one." So that Mr. *Talent* does not say expressly, that the Succession

Succession was to be taken from the one, more than the other.

As to the additional Facts to *St. Albans Miracles*, if *Fox* has mentioned them, the Author of the *Defence* will beg the Critick's Pardon when he meets with them in the Book referred to; but till then, he begs our Critick will not take it amiss, if he shews himself unwilling to take any Thing upon Trust from an Author of his extraordinary Character.

But to proceed;

Pag. 27. *He assures the World* (says the Critick) *that I never saw Caxton: A downright direct Untruth, which he backs by another, p. 73. 'Tis apparent that Fox never saw Caxton, though he pretends to Copy from him.*

Softer Words would have become our ingenious Critick: For, notwithstanding the Hard Language he gives, the Author of the *Defence* must still continue of the same Opinion, till it can be made appear, that his and *Fox's* Account are consistent with *Caxton's*, which it is plain they are not, as the Reader may be convinced by comparing our *Critical History*, and the *Defence of our Antient and Modern Historians*, p. 71. together.

His comparing *Dunstan* and Archbishop *Laud*, as it is Odious and Ill-natured, so it will not rebound much to the Credit of our Critick: For though the Comparison may, in some Respects, hold good, yet as to Archbishop *Laud's* insulting his Sovereign, as 'tis not in reallity true, so it may be confuted by every one who is conversant in the History of that Time.

As to the Story of *Ælfreda's* Miracles, till our Critick vouchsafes to quote the Edition and Page of *Malmsbury*, where it is to be met with, I believe the Author of the *Defence* (who is now too well acquainted

acquainted with his Character) will be unwilling to take his Word for it.

Pag. 29. *I said Edward, a Bastard, was crowned King by Ethelred's Procurement. Upon which he familiarly puts some Interrogatories to me; as, Who told him Edward was a Bastard? And then he lugs out Brady: A special Authority, as we shall see by and by.*

The Reader from hence might take it for granted, that the Author of the *Defence* had cited no other Authority but *Brady*, (was he not by this Time convinced that our Critick is not apt to treat his Adversaries too generously.) The Author of the *Defence*, I can assure him, has not only proved it from *Brady*, but from *Milton*, *Brompton*, *Simeon Dunelmensis*, *Walsingham*, and the *Chronicle of Walsingham*, as the Reader may be convinced by referring to the *Defence*, p. 66, 67.

Ibid. William of Malmesbury tells us, (says he) King Edgar debauched Egelfleda, or Ælfleda, Daughter of Duke Ordmer, and a Nun too, on whom he begot Edward in Bastardy, for which he was enjoined Penance by Dunstan, and afterwards took him a Lawful Wife, Elfrida, Mother of Edmund and Ethelred.

I can't find that Malmesbury says any such Thing, tho' I have carefully looked over the Life of Edgar and Edward, for that Purpose. Malmesbury's Words are as follow: *De Reb. Gest. Angl. cap 8. Huic Exemplo Cruditatis, adjunctum aliud Libidinis, Virginis Deo dicatae audiens pulchritudinem, violenter eam e monasterio abstraxit, abstracta pudorem rapuit, & non semel Thoro suo collocavit, quod cum Aurea Beati Dunstani offendisset vehementer ab eo increpatus Septennem penitentiam non fastidivit Dignatus Rex affligi jejuniis, simulque Diademate carere septennio.*

Ibid. Nam de Egelfleda cognomento Candida filia Ordmeri Ducis, Edwardum genuit, & Sanctam Editham de Wlfritha, quam certum est autum Sanctimoniam fuisse, sed timore Regis puellam laicam se velasse,

visse, eandem Arrepto velo, lecto Imperiali Subactam, unde offensum Beatum Dunstanum, quod illam concupisset, quæ vel umbratice Sanctimonialis fuisset, vigorem Pontificatus in eum egisse. Not one Word that I can meet with of Edgar's debauching Egelseda, a Nun, and begetting Edward in Bastardy.

But he says farther,

Ibid. That Simeon of Durham, and Hoveden, write That Alfer Duke of Mercia, and many other Nobles stood by Ethelred the only Right Heir, and Lawful Son of King Edgar. For this he has as much Authority, as he had for his last Assertion from Malmsbury. Simeon of Durham's Words are, Scriptor x. p. 135. *Post quem filius ejus Edwardus regnavit, qui Dolo Novercæ suæ interfectus Scestoniæ requiescit, cui Successit frater Ethelredus, quem Jussu cepit ex Emma.* And in another Place, p. 159. *Filium suum Eadwardum, & Regni & Morum Hæredem reliquit.* Nay, he tells us farther, p. 161. That Elfer, Duke of Mercia, took Care to have his Body honourably buried. Hoveden informs us, *Annal. Par. 1. Script. post Bed. p. 427.* "That Elfer, and several Great Men of the Kingdom, turned the Abbots and Monks out of the Monasteries, in which they had been placed by King Edgar." And then follow these Words: *Dum hæc aguntur de Rege Eligendo Magna inter Regni Principes oborta est Dissensio. Quidam enim Regis Filium Eadwardum, quidam vero Fratrem ejus elegerunt Egelredum: Quam ob causam Archiepiscopus, Dunstanus, & Oswaldus, cum Coepiscopis Abbatibus, Ducibusque Complurimis in unum conveniunt, & Eadwardum, ut Pater suus præceperat, elegerunt, electum consecraverunt, & in Regem auxerunt.* Not one Word of Ethelred's being the only Right Heir, and Lawful Son of Edgar.

Page 32. The Poisoning of King John at the Sacrament, he again brings upon the Stage: In which he say, The Doctor has not fairly quoted Caxton and Fox. But the Reader, who must be Judge

Judge of this, may be easily convinced of the Justness of the Quotations by comparing the two Accounts together, which differ in some material Circumstances, as the Author of the *Defence* has already proved, (*Defence*, &c. p. 70, 71, 72, 73.) And to say that *Fox* has copied *Caxton* verbatim, may be apt to make the Impartial Reader call *Fox*'s Veracity in question. And to pass over his long Character of Mr. *Fox*, which takes up two *Octavo* Pages (which might have been fairly omitted, had it been consistent with our Author's Prospect of Gain, from swelling his Book with Incongruities, long Digressions, and something else that shall be nameless,) he proceeds in his uncourtly Language; as, *finding the Brute under the Civilian's Gown, Incorrigible Creature*, and Flowers of the like kind, and this for no other Reason, but because the Author of the *Defence* has spoke the whole Truth, and nothiug but rhe Truth.

Then he goes on in his Way of Proving, to shew, That the Parliament, which was called *Parliamentum Indoctum*, or *Lack-Learning Parliament*, had as much Learning as any of the preceeding ones. In doing of which, he produces, against the Authority of *Trussel* and Mr. *Echard*, the Names of ten Members that had sat in former Parliaments. But allowing all this, and that those ten, were Men of Learning and real Worth, will it follow from thence that all the rest were so, or that this Parliament deserved any other Denomination from the Learning of these ten Members? His Ignorance (I hope the Reader will pardon the Coarseness of the Expression, when he knows the Gentleman I have to do withal) in not being able to distinguish betwixt the two Houses of *Lancaster* and *York*, yet remains, as the Reader may be convinced by comparing his *Review*, p. 37, with *Defence*, p. 78.

The next Inconsistency is his own, though he pretends to father it upon the Author of the *Defence*, or Mr. Echard, as the Reader will find by comparing his *Critical History*, p. 267. with *Defence*, p. 78.

In the next Page, he informs us, that there is an *Errat.* of the Press, of should be left out. But whoever will be at the Pains of looking upon the Passage, as it stands in the *Critical History*, will at once be convinced it was not the Fault of the Press, but our Critick, who goes on with equal *Modesty*, asserting from Bishop Burnet, That King Henry VIII. was never designed for a Scholar by his Father; and this, notwithstanding the Author of the *Defence* had produced the Authority of Father Paul, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and Mr. Collier, for the Proof thereof. But I find he will stand Buff against any Authorities, when he has the Great Bishop Burnet for his Second.

After running a Muck against Monks and Monasteries, and repeating the Words *Unfrocking* and *Unkennelling*, the Famous Penry's Character comes next upon the Stage; which being not wholly unlike his own, he is willing to vindicate it. From thence he proceeds in his abusive Language against the Author of the *Defence*; in which he says, he hopes to be excused by all Men of Sense and Manners for the Treatment Dr. Zachary meets with here. Very likely he may be excused by Men of like Sense and Manners with himself.

And then goes on,

Pag. 44. The many notorious Falsities I have, and shall prove upon him, teach one to use Phrases equal to his Character. Poor Man! How hard is it, that he is forced to make Excuses for his common Way of Writing: And if he will pardon the Freedom I take, I will tell him, that he has not yet, nor is he able to prove one single Falshood upon

upon the Author of the *Defence*. Nay, when he has attempted to do it, I believe the Reader will find, that the Falshood has always recoil'd back again upon himself.

After a good deal of unkind Language,

He goes to compare the Characters of *Whitlock* and *Rushworth* with my Lord *Clarendon*. But as my Lord *Clarendon's* Character is too well established, to suffer by the Comparison, it would be needless and impertinent in me, to speak any Thing farther in Praise of his History, since even our Critick's *Polite* Language will not be able to lessen it.

He proceeds now to the Second Part of the *Defence*, and tells us,

Pag. 45. *That the Author has falsified him in the very first Quotation.* If so, it was without Design, and I dare say, the Author (if it can be made appear) will beg his Pardon for it, which will prove, *That he has less Brass in his Forehead, than the Head of the Statue at Charing-Cross*; a Piece of Wit which has been treasur'd up in our Critick's common Place for some Time, and shews him to be a Man of Metal: But in what Part it lays I leave the Reader, from what has been already said, to judge. But what, I should be glad to know, could occasion all this Outcry of *Falsifying*? The Author of the *Defence* (he says) had put these Words into the *Critical History*: *In the four following Reigns, there is no History upon which the Reader can depend.* His Words: *There is no History of the four following Reigns, upon which one may depend.* A great Difference indeed! and what is sufficient to justify so much Clamour and Outcry!

But he assures us, notwithstanding this, *that there are several upon which one may depend, as Rushworth, Whitlock, Hollis, Lock, Calamy, Marvel:*

30 An APPENDIX.

Marvel: To whom we might add *Ludlow, Baxter, Jones, Coke, Walker, Philips*. If so, I will give the Reader my Word, that our *Critick* is not to be depended upon; for he has unfairly quoted, or contradicted several of these, as has been abundantly proved already by the Author of the *Defence*.

In the following Page he gives us to understand,

Pag. 46. *That the Author of the Defence has shew'd himself guilty of Falshood, Insolence, Ignorance, and Ill-Manners, in saying, That he questioned whether the Critick ever saw one Manuscript relating to English History. And how does he prove the contrary? Truly he tells us, That he recommended to Mr. Echard one of the most valuable Manuscripts relating to the Reign of King Charles II. mentioned by himself, p. 879. But how shall I be assured of this? Mr. Echard is not at hand to inform me, whether it is Truth, or not; and I hope he will pardon me, if, without much better Vouchers, I shall be unwilling to take his Word for it.*

Pag. 47. The Story of *Cromwell*, and the Devil must again be dragg'd upon the Stage. He thinks *Mr. Echard* should have struck it out of his History, and that the retracting of it in his *Appendix*, is not sufficient. But I will leave *Mr. Echard* and him to talk upon this Head when they meet, as probably some Time or other they may. The History of *Standing Armies* is next introduced, wherein is given the most wicked Character of King *James I.* and King *Charles I.* and for this Reason, I suppose it may be reckon'd worthy of his *Defence*.

Pag. 48. *Osbourne's* Authority he thinks fit to oppose a second Time to Archbishop *Spotswood's*, with Relation to what he calls *Earl Gowry's Tragedy*, and there I will leave it with the Reader.

In the next Page he falls foul upon *Sir Philip Warwick*. But *Sir Philip's* Veracity is too well known

known by all Persons conversant in the History of those Times, to stand in need of a new Defence, or to suffer by the Pen of so ingenious a Writer as our Critical Historian.

Pag. 49. *Whitlock the Memorialist* (says he) *does not say one Word of Archbishop Laud's being a just and good Man, tho' too full of Fire.* And who says he does? The Author of the Defence says *Whitlock* says so, and refers to the *Memorial*, where it is to be found: But they are, indeed, the Words of Judge *Whitlock*, and not of his Son.

Pag. 50. *In the next Quotation, (he tells us,) That the Author of the Defence brings Collier in with him, as a Proof that Dr. Leighton, Father of the Seraphick Archbishop of Glasgow, deserved to be gaol'd as long as the King pleased, to pay ten thousand Pounds, to be twice barbarously whipped, to have both his Ears cut off, his Nose slit, his Face stigmatized.* Here again we have our Critick at his old Trade of — Mr. *Collier* is only brought in as a Proof of his being Doctor of Physick, and not of Divinity, *Defence, p. 123.* And *Leighton's* Character is there given by Dr. *Fuller, Church Hist. Cent. 17. B. xi. p. 126.* whether I refer the Reader.

I am glad to find that he has no more to say against good Bishop *Jaxon*, whose Character I had given from *Whitlock*, Sir *Philip Warwick*, Lord *Clarendon*, Dr. *Fuller*, and Dr. *Webwood*, then this, (which he takes from *Whitlock*.) *That he kept a Pack of good Hounds, and had as much Command of himself, as his Hounds.* I should have been in Hopes that he was coming to Temper again, by this lucid Interval, did I not find him, in the next Paragraph, flying out in his Invectives against Mr. *Collier*, because I have given a Character of Mr. *Prynn* from him and Sir *Philip Warwick*? And instead of detecting him of Falshood in this Character as an Historian, he flies out against him, and

and tells us, *He absolved a Traytor and Assassine at the Gallows; which I take to be very foreign to his Purpose.*

Pag. 52. *I still tell Dr. Zachary, that Robert Harley's Name was not Robert Harlow, (Vid. List of Long Parliament for Hereford.) No, 'tis very unlikely it should. And in return, I will take the Liberty of telling our Critical Historian, that the Name of the Person who was instrumental in taking down the Crosses in Cheapside and Charing-Cross was not Robert Harley, but Robert Harlow, (Vid. Whitlock's Memor. p. 45.)*

Pag. 53. The next Instance of his great Sagacity, is, concerning the ten Members of the Assembly of Divines, whom the Author of the Defence proves to have been no Doctors, when they were first assembled. *He finds them, he tells us, from Dr. Calamy, to be Doctors either before the Assembly, or during their Session, or after Oliver dissolved them.*

And who I pray denies this? He gave this Account of them in his *Critical Hist.* p. 221. as first assembled, and asserts seventeen of them to have been then Doctors: The contrary to which, as to ten of them, is plainly proved by the Author of the Defence from *Scobel's Collections of Acts and Ordinances*, p. 43.

He goes on triumphantly, and says, Pag. 57. *That Dr. Zachary, to make him a Forger of the Marquis of Hertford's Speech at Uxbridge, tells us, he has been looking about it, and cannot find it in the Eikon Basilike.* Here again, notwithstanding his large Pretences to Honesty, as well as Criticism, he chanceth to be mistaken. The ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ is not once named by Dr. Zachary upon this Occasion: But King Charles I's Works are referred to; amongst which is an Account of the Treaty at Uxbridge. The following Pages concerning *Ascham's Death, Cromwell's Carcass, and Sir Henry Vane's Death*, I shall pass over, as containing

containing nothing, but what has been fully answered already in the *Defence*.

He informs us,

Pag. 63. That the Author of the *Defence* brings out a *Chronicle*, written by one Heath, which is the best Book upon his Shelf, and that our Doctor has made marvellous Use of him. And who would not imagine, after all this, That the Author of the *Defence* had quoted him almost in every Page of his Book? But so it happens, that he has used his Authority but four Times in his whole Book, twice indeed alone; and twice with much better Authorities. He tells us,

Ibid. That he thinks he shall scarce have Patience with him, when he labours to load the Dissenters with the Fire of London; and his Authority, is, *The Caveat against the Whigs*. His Authority (begging the Critick's Pardon) is the *London Gazette*, from Thursday, April 26. to Monday, April 30. 1666. an authentick Paper, inserted in the *Caveat against the Whigs*: Nor does he endeavour to load the Dissenters with it; but only to prove, that Mr. *Echard* had some Authority for what he had said in this Case, and to shew what Opinion the Government had of that Matter at that Time.

He spends two or three Pages upon the Popish Plot, and in calumniating Persons, who, I presume, may, at least, be accounted his Equals; and then falls foul upon the Author of the *Defence*, because he has exposed him in a Matter as plain as the Sun, with Relation to the Number of Persons which the Pinnacle of a Fifth Rate Man of War was capable of holding.

In Pag. 88. he tells us, That the Law-Doctor shews, that instead of not understanding History and Eloquence, he knows nothing at all, [Mark his Flowers Reader.] Bishop Burnet had said of my Lord Chancellor Finch,

he was long much admired for his Eloquence, but it was laboured and affected, and he saw it much despised before he died. To prove it was not so, Grey produces his old Friend Echard, and others, saying he was an incorrupt Judge. Bless the Soul of him, &c. Grey, as he calls him, was proving from Mr. Echard, and our Critick's dear Self, That Bishop Burnet was inconsistent in the Character he gave of this great Man: He was not endeavouring to shew, that his Integrity was a Proof of his Eloquence, as this modest Gentleman, without any Warrant at all, asserts, as the Reader may be convinced, by referring to Defence, p. 188.

Pag. 72. In the next Page (says he,) he boldly affirms, That the Doctrines of Passive-Obedience and Non-Resistance are not engrafted into the Doctrines of the Church. He proves, (with Submission,) That they were not lately engrafted into the Doctrines of our Church, as our Critick had asserted, and produces the Six Homilies of the Church against Wilful Rebellion: The Authority of which our Critick, with All his great Learning, will find it no easy Matter to invalidate.

Pag. 72. Now draws on (says he) the most horrible Scene that ever was opened in the Christian World, (not excepting our Saviour's Crucifixion,) the Murder of the Illustrious Lord Russel, &c. whose Blood he drenches himself with. So far from it, that he only endeavours to prove from my Lord's own Words, the small Share he bore in that Plot; which Words our Critick thought proper to leave out, to make Room for his passionate Exclamations.

Pag. 73. He calls me to repent of the many Calumnies upon the best of Princes, and best of Men, and I dare him to prove that I have said one Word or Syllable against the best of Princes. A strange unreasonable Gentleman! to call out for Proof, when

when it is already proved from almost every Page of his Book. I desire the Reader to consult the Character he has given of King James I. and King Charles I. from the History of *Standing Armies*; and he will meet with ample Proof of what the Author of the *Defence* has asserted.

And to pass over his Reflections upon the inferior Clergy, which are too gross to make an Impression any where, I will beg Leave to draw out some of his fine Flowers, to shew the Reader what a Courtly and Complaisant Writer he is. Such dull Mortals as our Doctor. A Man of our Doctor's Forehead and Intellects, is not to be treated with Smiles, and soft Airs. He rather deserved a Drubbing, then a Review. Pag. 8. The Doctor has so much Stupidity, or something worse in the Make of him. Ibid. Mark what a clear-headed Doctor this is. Pag. 11. Is he to be matched for a fine Head, and an honest Heart? Pag. 12. This Rarity. Pag. 13. He's surprisingly Dull. Pag. 14. As poor as he is in Intellect. Pag. 23. For which he deserves good Discipline. Pag. 25. Who understood no Tongue, but what is taught by every Country-Pedagogue. Pag. 26. I am a Stranger to his Manners, which are indeed of the Dregs of the People. Pag. 27. Match my Doctor, if you can, for Stupidity and Assurance. Ibid. A downright direct Untruth, which he backs with another. Pag. 28. A positive Falsity, in Defiance of Conscience or Modesty. Pag. 34. The Brute will be found out under the Civilian's Gown. Ibid. If I had been born under the same Hovel, I could not have known his Quality and Conversation better. Pag. 35. The most incorrigible Creature. Pag. 39. Our Doctor crows like a true Cock of the Dunghill. Ibid. Here his Forehead shines again, and his Folly surprizes one. Pag. 40. He is an over-bearing confident Fellow. Pag. 41. If he had any Eyes in his Head, or Guts in his Brains. Pag. 44. To mix Clean Language with his Dirty, would be like putting on clean Linnen to rake in a Kennel.

Pag. 45. *There is as much Metal in this, as in the Fore-head of the Statue at Charing-Cross.* Pag. 47. *I found out what he was by his Breeding and Language, before I knew whether he were a Man or a Monkey.* Pag. 53. *His Conscience and his Head open and shut, so that they can't hold two Lines together; so that he will be always falsifying or blundering.* Pag. 56. *His Metal is burnish'd up again, and one of the most senseless Untruths that ever was uttered, keeps his Hand in.* Pag. 61. *The very Vermin of the Party learn this Air.* Ibid. *Dr. Zachary apes it, and is as awkward, as he's impudent.* Ibid. *This unparalleled Doctor, [Mark his Spelling, Reader.]* Pag. 73. *I never met with a Mortal so stupid.* Pag. 76. *You might as well shew a Picture to the Horse in Stocks-Market.* And is not this, after all, a most Genteel Writer? Does not his Good-Breeding shew him to be the Man (he boasts himself to be, *Pref. p. 9.*) whose House and Lands had the same Boundaries, and the same Name for their Owner, six or seven hundred Years ago, as they have now?

And now having put this Specimen of the Author's Critical Skill in History, and his faithful Remembrance of what he has Occasion to make use of, into the Reader's Hands, and likewise presented him with this Garland of his sweet Flowers of Rhetorick, I shall finally take my Leave: He may henceforth go on, and write all the History he can invent, vilify whom he will, or can, contradict whom he please, he may rest assured he shall never more be answered by me, nor any one else, (I believe,) unless he should answer himself; which is a known Practice among Writers; who are sensible they have no equal Match.

F I N I S.

